From:	PETERSON Jenn L
To:	Jay.Field@noaa.gov; Robert.Neely@noaa.gov; chris.thompson@eiltd.net; jeremy_buck@fws.gov; Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc:	Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject:	FW: Floating Percentile Calculations
Date:	02/09/2006 01:35 PM
Attachments:	FPM Method Comparisons.doc DataSummary.xls 4-FPV-CHG-L1-mra.xls

---

FYI.

We are making progress on this issue, but as you can see we are still in the process of model review. At some point, it might be good to have a brief update meeting on the topic where we can all give a status report on the models. I would like to update everyone (but esp. Jay) on what was discussed with Teresa at last weeks meeting.

-Jennifer

> -----Original Message-----
> From: ANDERSON Michael R
> Sent: Thu 2/9/2006 11:39 AM
> To: Teresa Michelsen
> Cc: PETERSON Jenn L; POULSEN Mike
> Subject: Floating Percentile Calculations

Attached are some files that I am sending as a follow-up to our meeting on 1/30/06.

The word document describes my review of the spreadsheet macros in order to look for potential causes for the difference in %FP that we see in every calculation (DEQ values are always higher). I didn't find a simple answer like an error in a macro, but I did find some differences that I believe are the cause and I want to try to redo some of the calculations with those differences in mind.

The data summary spreadsheet is the same as the one that I handed out at the meeting except that I have added the results for the data sets that I didn't have at that time, mostly CH data I believe. All of the AET results are provided even though I believe we all agreed that just using the AETs is probably not the best way to go.

The last file is the DEQ spreadsheet with calculations for one of the data sets. To run it you put a set of data into the appropriate columns on the ChemData page and then click on the button at the right. The spreadsheet builds all of the remaining pages and places the results on the Criteria page. The DataStorage page is just there for me to place the LWG and DEQ data together for comparison. This spreadsheet can simplify the calculations by screening out all compounds for which the AETs are the best results. It can also eliminate outliers from consideration as AETs, where outliers are max NoHit values that are > 3x the next highest no-hit value. The process can continue if there is more than one outlier in the data set.

I'm adding something to the spreadsheet that can also be used to screen out chemicals with less than a designated number of data points. I'll send a copy of that spreadsheet when I have it.

I would like to know, from all three of you, what additional tests are high priority other than my plans to better refine the evaluation of performance measures and recalculate the existing CHG, CHM, CHP, HYG, HYM, and HYP data sets (see memo).

If there are any questions about this, please let me know.

Thanks.
M.A.